

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 18-21 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (2005/0145075 A1) in view of Hsien (6,845,691).

In addition, claim 22 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (2005/0145075 A1) in view of Hsien (6,845,691), and further in view of Lack (4,561,329).

In addition, claims 23 and 25-28 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (2005/0145075 A1) in view of Hsien (6,845,691), and further in view of Lack (4,561,329).

In addition, claim 24 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (2005/0145075 A1) in view of Lack (4,561,329), and further in view of Hsien (6,845,691).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 1, 3, 7, 8 and 13-17 are allowed.

Responsive to this, claims 18-28 have been deleted.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1, 3, 7, 8 and 13-17 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. Baxley

by Charles E. Baxley

Attorney for Applicant

Charles E. Baxley

Third Floor

90 John Street

New York, N.Y. 10038-3243